



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HOMERICA

I. ἄκρητον γάλα, ι 297

BY W. A. OLDFATHER

The brutal Cyclops has just devoured two of Odysseus' companions for his evening meal. Then "we wept and lifted up our hands to Zeus at sight of these dread deeds, and helpless fear gat hold of our hearts. But when the Cyclops had filled his huge maw, devouring the flesh of men and drinking thereafter unmixed milk, he lay down within the cave stretched out among the sheep." The attentive reader must surely be struck by the curious phrase "unmixed milk" (ἄκρητον γάλα). The text is perfectly sound; there is not a single MS variant, and an old scholium guarantees the antiquity of the reading. The translators in different languages vary in turning the word either with "pure"¹ or "unmixed," Messrs. Butcher and Lang discreetly omitting the word entirely. The commentators leave us almost entirely in the lurch, only a few deigning to note the word and they shedding no real light on its meaning. An exception must be made, however, in favor of our oldest commentator, the source of the scholiast of MS H, but here a corrupt and misunderstood text has stood in the way of the exact interpretation of this passage, as I shall show at the end of this paper.

It will be convenient to consider such chance opinions as I have been able to find on this subject in their chronological order. W. Dindorf, in the revised Thesaurus, collects passages where ἄκρητον is used of water, and then cites our verse with the observation that this is an instance of *katachresis*. If this be true of Homer,² the same must be said of similar usages in Sophron, Antipater of Sidon, and Dio Cassius, and so much misuse of a word among good authors is surprising. In employing a word like "unmixed," you naturally imply that the substance you are speaking of is frequently mixed with other things, e.g., unmixed wine is wine without the common

¹ Of course "pure" in a literal sense the milk could not have been. In the sense of "mere," it is pointless.

² I take ἀκήρατον in Ω 303 (ἀκήρατον ὕδωρ) as only a doublet of ἀκρητον.

admixture of water, unmixed water is water without the admixture of salt, mud, sand, alkali, etc. Therefore, unmixed milk should be milk which has not been mixed with that substance with which, under the circumstances, you might have expected it to be mixed. It is more appropriate to look for that substance than to assume faulty usage.

To K. F. Ameis in a note on this passage is due an explanation which has imposed on Buchholz,¹ La Roche,² and even on such a scholar as O. Hentze.³ In his own words: "Die mässigen Griechen tranken auch die fette Milch meist mit Wasser gemischt wie den Wein," to which La Roche adds that for the Cyclops to drink his milk *ἄκρητον*, i.e., "straight," was "auch ein Zeichen der Unmässigkeit." For this bit of *Scholiastenweisheit* no authorities are adduced, or, perhaps, adduceable. Instances of adulteration of milk with water are not unheard of, but they are generally induced by commercial motives rather than by those of temperance. Despite a few known cases of watering milk for one's own consumption⁴, the Cyclops was, nevertheless, perhaps the last person in the world of Homeric figures of whom one might have expected such refinement in matters of food and drink as to make it a significant fact that he drank even his milk "straight." Not to mention other evidence that his tastes were not in all respects very finical, it will perhaps be sufficient to observe that the evening meal in question was a couple of raw human beings whom he grasped and "hurled to the ground like puppies, and their brains oozed out and soaked the earth. And he cut them up and made ready his meal, and devoured them like a mountain-bred lion, the entrails, the meat, and the marrowy bones, and left nothing!"

Professors Perrin and Seymour in their edition (Boston, 1897, *ad*

¹ *Die homerischen Realien*, II, 1, Leipzig, 1881, p. 150.

² Ed. Wien, 1892, *ad loc.*

³ In the 9th ed., Leipzig, 1895, *ad loc.*

⁴ Dr. J. D. Fitzgerald calls my attention to the fact that occasionally in the Midi and in Spain milk is diluted with water before drinking. I can find no evidence of such a custom among modern Greek peasants; indeed, the widespread habit of compelling the milkman to do his milking in the presence of the purchaser in order to guard against diluting the milk (cf. George Horton, *Modern Athens*, New York, 1901, pp. 40 f.) implies that the Greek does not care to purchase, at least, the combination of milk and water. As no books on Modern Greece which I have seen mention the habit, and none of my friends who have spent several years in the country have observed it, I judge that it cannot be a widespread custom, even if it exists at all.

loc.) observe that the epithet is "half-humorous . . . from the custom of diluting wine." I am inclined to challenge even the "half-humorous" in this connection. To be sure, there is much humor in Homer, more than is commonly recognized perhaps, and especially in the Cyclopeia, though even here mainly toward the end, where the witty trick of Odysseus is succeeding, or about to succeed, and the situation is less tense. But here humor, even half-humor, were obviously out of place. Few passages in ancient literature are more realistically horrible than this, the monster at his loathsome feast, the wretched survivors cowering in the recesses of the cave and raising their hands to Zeus in anguish and despair. It is incredible that in the midst of this Homer would perpetrate a silly pun in the feeblest style of Charles Lamb.

To an American sociologist, Dr. Keller,¹ we owe the latest explanation I have seen. He observes that the epithet here (together with some quite inconsequential praise of the abundance of pastoral products in Libya) "seems to point to a scarcity of the article [namely milk] in Greece." This remark implies not only that milk was positively scarce in Greece, but also that when milk is scarce people who live upon it add water so as to increase its bulk for their own consumption. Now there is very little that could be accepted as evidence for the first point, i.e., that the pastoral population of Heroic times suffered from a permanent shortage in milk supply,² and I know of none at all for the second.

Yet another explanation, which surprisingly enough seems never to have been offered, would be that we have here a misplaced stereotyped epithet of the type of the "starry heavens." To this we answer that the combination *ἄκρητον γάλα* occurs nowhere else in extant Greek literature and so could never have been a stereotyped formula, and even in connection with wine, *ἄκρητον* was so seldom used that it could not possibly owe its presence here to an inept intrusion from a memory well stored with verse tags. Even at that, however, this would be a better explanation than any of the preceding.

¹ Homeric Society, New York, 1902, p. 47. The second edition I have not been able to consult.

² Compare the famous simile, II 641 ff., of the spring time when the white milk wets the pails; and certainly the 10,000 ewes which are being milked in the court of a rich man (Δ 433 ff.) are, despite the obvious exaggeration, suggestive of abundance.

But we do not need it. As suggested above, all we have to do is to find some substance with which the milk in this particular connection might very naturally have been mixed. To do so we shall have to look only a little away from this very passage. The first thing the thrifty Odysseus observed on entering the cave was the large number of willow baskets that were heavy with cheese (vs. 219), and a little later on he describes a portion of the Cyclops' evening chores in these words: "Then he sat down and milked the ewes and bleating goats all orderly, and beneath each ewe he placed her young, and anon he curdled [literally "he treated"] one-half of the white milk and massed it together and stored it in wicker baskets, and the other half he let stand in pails, that he might have it to drink against supper time" (Butcher and Lang). You will observe that it is the *fresh* milk which he curdles, a process which must therefore have been accomplished by artificial means, and this curdled milk is then put into wicker baskets for the whey to drain off—as nowadays a bit of cloth (called cheese-cloth for that reason) is used in making cottage cheese. This process was preparatory to pressing it firmly together into the large and solid cheese cakes at some later occasion. We have already observed that the milk was artificially curdled, but how? At present rennet is regularly used for this purpose, and such use of rennet was known to the Greeks also, but that was not the earliest process employed, nor the commonest. Originally they extracted the juice of the wild fig tree, *ὀπός* they called it, and stirred a few drops of it into a bucket of milk, which then coagulated with great rapidity. Aristotle in several passages describes and tries to explain the process (see the index of Bonitz, *s.v.*), and references to it are frequent in the lexicographers.¹ Empedocles² described his world-constructing force of *φιλία* under the figure of the *ὀπός*, "which bolts and binds the white milk." But, more to the point, Homer was himself perfectly familiar with the process. In the *Iliad* (E 902 ff.) the physician-god Paieon heals Ares by rubbing ointments over the wound, and then: "Even as fig juice

¹ Apoll. Soph. *Lex. Hom.* 122, 3: *ὀπός* · τὸ τῶν δένδρων δάκρυον . . . εἰδικῶς μέντοι "Ὀμηρος οἶδεν ὀπὸν τινα λεγόμενον ὡς ὅταν λέγῃ κτλ; Hesych. *s.v.* *πυτίων* (MSS) is inaccurate in speaking of it as *βοτάνη τις*, δι' οὗ πηγγνυται τὸ γάλα; Suidas (*s.v.*), τὸ ἀποστάλαγμα τοῦ γάλακτος, and *s.v.* *πυτία* · ὁ ὀπὸς ὁ τυρεῖων τὸ γάλα. Compare further especially Dioskorides I, 184 (copied by Pliny 23, 7) and Varro, *R.R.* 2, 11.

² Frg. 33 Diels² *ap. Plut. Mor.* 95a.

[ὀρός¹] maketh haste to thicken white milk, that is liquid but curdleth speedily as a man stirreth, even so swiftly healed he impetuous Ares" (Lang, Leaf and Myers). The "unmixed milk" is now perfectly plain. The Cyclops had stirred a few drops of ὀρός into half of his milk in order to curdle it for making cheese; the rest of his milk he left as it was for drinking purposes, i.e., he did not mix in any of the coagulating juice; it was therefore, properly speaking, the "unmixed milk" which he drank later on, after supper. We might have called it the "sweet," or the "straight," or "ordinary" milk, but it was strictly and literally "unmixed," exactly what the poet called it without any danger of being misunderstood by his audience, ruder perhaps, but in this detail at least more sophisticated than some of his later commentators. Some, I say, for I believe the source of the scholium in H had the correct idea. At present (in Dindorf's ed.) it reads thus: ἀπεριμιγές ἔχον καὶ ὀρῶδες καὶ τὸ τυρῶδες καὶ τὸ ἐλαιῶδες. This is obviously corrupt, even for scholiastic Greek. We should read ἀπεριμιγές · ἔχον καὶ <τὸ> ὀρῶδες κτλ, and this reading is substantiated by the form which originally the same note takes in Eustathios (1630, 39, *ad loc.*): ἄκρητον δὲ γάλα λέγει ἐν ᾧ ἔστιν ἔτι τὸ τυρῶδες καὶ τὸ ἐλαιῶδες καὶ τὸ ὀρῶδες, which means "unmixed milk is that which still contains the element of cheese [the curds], that of oil [the butter, or cream] and that of whey," in other words, milk which contains its three most obvious parts as yet unseparated either by standing (for the cream), or by curdling for the separation of curds and whey.²

¹ As a lexicographical note might be added the following: ὀρός=rennet as the curdler par excellence. Schol. B on E 902: ὁ δὲ ὀρός ἡ παρὰ τοῖς ἰδιώταις λεγόμενη πιτύα · ἔνιοι δὲ λέγουσι τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν σύκων ὀρόν · βέλτιον δὲ τὸ πρῶτον; and Eusth. *ad loc.*, 619, 41: κυρίως ὀρός καλεῖται ἡ τὸν τυρὸν συμπήττουσα πνεύλα . . . τῶν τις δὲ παλαιῶν φησιν · ὀρός ἡ πύτλα . . . obviously, as the quotation shows, a usage very much older than the time of even Schol. B. This is perhaps what Dindorf had in mind in the Thes. *s.v.* πύτλα with the observation: "alio nomine ὀρός dictum κατ' ἐξοχήν," but he has not expressed himself with perfect clearness.

The byform πιτύα for πύτλα for πνεύλα, rennet. See Theophrastos, *Hist. Plant.*, 9, 11, 3, φώκης πιτύα, and frg. 125 (Phot. *Bibl.* 278, 8), ἡ φώκη ἐξεμεῖ τὴν πιτύαν; Schol. B on E 902 (above). It is also a variant reading in Aristotle *περὶ θανμας ἀκουσμ.* 77 (835b, 31), which is a close parallel to the passages from Theophrastos, and again in *περὶ ζῴων γεν.* 1, 20, 18 (729a, 12). Compare further Hesych. πύτλα, changed by Schmidt to πύτλα, and Schneider's *Theophrastos* (Leipzig, 1821), V, 480.

² Much interesting material regarding the names for milk and the value set upon it in Indo-Germanic times is contained in Hermann Brunnhofer's interesting monograph: *Γάλα, Lac, der graeco-italische Name der Milch*, Aarau, 1871.

II. *κουρίδιος ἄλοχος* A 114 *et passim*

Very different is the question concerning the significance of *κουρίδιος*, an adjective occurring frequently in Homer¹ in agreement with words referring to the marriage relation, and but rarely elsewhere.² One is here embarrassed by the multitude of counselors. The true etymology and the original significance of the word were in dispute already in antiquity, and frequent have been the discussions in modern times.³ It would take many pages to enumerate the different explanations that have been offered and to point out their shortcomings in detail, so I shall merely state my own opinion and then give the arguments for it at some length, not because it is an entirely new view, but because no elaborate attempt has yet been made to demonstrate the correctness of it.

I feel certain that the adjective is derived from *κοῦρος* or *κούρη*, *κόρη* to which the suffix *-ίδιος* (originally doubtless *-φίδιος*; cf. Brugmann's discussion cited in note 3, below) has been added, as *νύμφη*, *νυμφίδιος*, etc., and that the primary significance is "of or pertaining to youth," either male or female, in the widest sense. At the same time the word in Homer, frequently at least,⁴ means "of or pertaining to formal marriage," and universally bears this meaning in the later literature. The difficulty of squaring these two facts has called out several very different etymologies, no one of which, however, can be considered plausible. The derivation from *κοῦρος*, "youth," is certain for the following reasons: (1) it is so obvious that if any reasonable explanation can be given it must be accepted, and this explanation can in my opinion be furnished; (2) it is the derivation which the

¹ It is used with *ἄλοχος*, A 114, H 392, A 243, N 626, T 298, ξ 245, ο 356; *πόσις*, E 414, λ 430, ψ 150, ω 200; *ἀνὴρ*, τ 266, ω 196; *γυνή*, ν 45; *φίλος*, ο 22; *δῶμα*, τ 580 (= φ 78); *λέχος* O 40.

² The best survey of the usage is in L. Meyer, *Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie*, II (Leipzig, 1901), 386 f.

³ The earlier literature is best summed up in Ebeling's *Lexicon*, s.v. I add the most important contributions with which I am familiar since the date of that publication: W. Schulze, *Quaest. Epic.*, Gütersloh, 1892, p. 85, n. 2; W. Prellwitz, *Bezz. Beitr.* XIX (1893), 318, n. 1; L. Meyer, *loc. cit.*; A. Bezenberger, *Bezz. Beitr.* XXVII (1902), 170; K. Brugmann, *Indog. Forsch.* XVI (1904), 492; W. Prellwitz, *Etymol. Wörterb. d. griech. Sprache*,² Göttingen, 1905, p. 240; Émile Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Heidelberg and Paris, 1911, pp. 503 f.; Zubatý, *Listy filologické*, 31 (1904), 409-19, has not been accessible.

⁴ See below at the end.

Greeks generally gave; and (3)—a point which has never been noted but seems quite conclusive—as a cult-epithet of Apollo (who had nothing specifically to do with marriage), the original significance “of or pertaining to youth” is maintained.¹ Considering the extreme tenacity of cult-titles and appellations, this usage unmistakably points to a time when *κουρίδιος* was commonly recognized to mean that which on its face it should. Apollo was a god of youth and youths under this name, and any other interpretation of it is impossible.

In order to explain the postulated development and restriction of meaning it is necessary to look a little outside Homer for a better understanding of the conditions obtaining in primitive marriage. Aristarchos' principle, “Ὀμηρον ἐξ Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν, was needed at his time, and always will be, in order to guard against confusing ideas and attitudes of mind that belong to quite different levels of culture, and not a little modern criticism, as well as a very great deal of what the ancients did, is useless for this very reason. But to compare Homer with the same general stage of culture as his own, a stage which, in externals at least, has been reached pretty much over the whole world, and on points where he is reticent or obscure (as, for example, precisely in this matter of the marriage relation) to contrast the well-understood conditions which have prevailed in similar civilizations, past and present, is not only justifiable, but necessary, if we wish to understand the little which the poet actually does tell us.

Now among polygamous peoples, who, in general, are at about the same level of culture regarding the social status of women as Homer, we find marriage primarily an economic institution, rarely and then

¹ For Apollo *κουρίδιος* see Hesych. s.v., and especially at Amyklai and Sparta s.v. *κυννακίας*; Sosibios (*F.H.G.*, II, 627, 11); cf. Libanios II, p. 371 M, etc. That this Apollo was *τετράχειρ* and *τετράωτος* has no apparent significance for the name *κουρίδιος*, cf. Wernicke in Pauly-Wissowa II, Sp. 70, 31 ff. The function referred to in this name is evidently the same as that meant by *κούρεος* (at Teos, *B.C.H.*, 1880, p. 168), *κουροτρόφος* (schol. on *Odyssey* τ 86; Eusth. *Il.*, 1293, 3, and *Od.*, 1856, 33), etc., as Apollo was to a striking degree the god of young persons (see the latest very excellent discussion of this point in Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, V, 1907, 148, and the references, pp. 371 f.). Athene was also closely related to Apollo in this aspect as she too was one of the *θεοὶ κουροτρόφοι* (cf. Farnell I, 1896, p. 328, and Gruppe, *Griech. Mythol. u. Religionsgeschichte*, pp. 1205 f.). Compare her titles *κοῖρα* (Paus., 8, 21, 3) and *κορησία* (Steph. *Byz.* s.v. *κόριον*), and for the close connection between Apollo and Athene in this aspect, the dissertation of C. Bruchmann, *De Apolline et Minerva deis medicis*, Breslau, 1885, p. 37 (not 36 as Gruppe cites it).

mainly by accident illumined by that romantic halo which we conventionally assume for it. A woman represents among the poor either so much labor-power, like an ox or a mule, and so is carefully bargained for, or else, as among the rich and powerful, she brings in, by cementing friendly relations with influential folk, such prestige, power, or wealth, that the most elaborate covenants and contracts are drawn up between her past and her future owners. Indeed, so prosaic a thing is marriage to the vast majority of the human race, past and present, that a wedding without first buying up the bride and her parents, or else bribing the husband and his relatives, is difficult to imagine. Now this purpose of strengthening the husband's family by an accession of labor-power, capital, or prestige, being the dominant motive for marriage, it naturally follows that there is everywhere felt a strong inclination toward early marriage, while the son is yet a member of his father's house. Benziger¹ gives a vivid description of how among the fellaheen of the Turkish empire the marriage is completely arranged for in all its business details by the parents of the prospective bride and groom (who are always in their early teens when not even younger), and how the son and his young and vigorous wife remain under the parental roof and help to maintain the establishment. It is stated of the Basutos of South Africa, that "the choice of the great wife [i.e., the first wife] is generally made by the father, and all the relations are interested," while the later wives are significantly called "the heels," and the father is not expected to contribute to their support.² Similarly Hagar sees to getting an Egyptian wife for Ishmael (Gen. 21:21), Abraham feels the responsibility of securing a wife for Isaac (Gen., chap. 34), and even the footloose and unconventional Samson came to his father and mother and said: "I have seen a woman in Timnath of the

¹ *Hebräische Archäologie* (1894), pp. 138 ff. Cf. also W. Nowack, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Archäologie*, I, 156 ff., Baldensperger's "Woman in the East," *Palestine Explor. Fund. Quart. Statement*, 1899, 1900, 1901, and the most systematic and detailed discussion by Thad. Engert, *Ehe- und Familienrecht der Hebräer*, München, 1905, pp. 40 f., as well as A. S. Cook, *The Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi*, London, 1903, pp. 74 f., for similar customs in ancient Israel, Arabia, and Babylonia. The elaborate care with which all the details of a marriage among the powerful in early Canaan were agreed upon beforehand is excellently illustrated in the Tel-el-Amarna Letters, Nos. 17, 21, and 23.

² Westermarck in the work cited below, p. 446.

daughters of the Philistines; now therefore get her for me to wife" (Judg. 14:2)¹; or, to take an example from Homer, Achilles repudiates the offer of one of Agamemnon's daughters in marriage with the remark: "If the gods save me and I reach home, then will Peleus hunt me out a wife himself" (I, 393 f.). These are only typical cases whose number might have been multiplied indefinitely from the world-wide prevalence of the custom. Such being the economic basis of marriage in primitive conditions, one can easily understand the temptation toward child-marriage, which has been, and is, very widespread, not only in Islam and India, but among Semites, Africans, Australians, etc. Where the economic feature of marriage is especially prominent, the head of the household, who is socially responsible for the support of his family, naturally seeks to get all the advantages he can from the wedding of a son or a daughter, so that marriage in the tenderest state of infancy is frequent enough, and betrothals of the yet unborn not unknown.²

The first wife is therefore among all polygamous peoples married in comparative youth, her selection is made with all the care and forethought that an interested kinship can bestow upon the cementing of a lasting relation, and of course the best and sharpest bargain is driven. By virtue of the dowry she brings with her, or because of the total loss of the bridegift if she be divorced (not to speak of the offense that would be given her kin and the weakening in capital or labor-power that would result to her husband's house), the first wife is strongly fortified in her position by permanent economic considerations of a very substantial sort. Being thus carefully chosen, there can never be any doubt of the perfect propriety and legitimacy of this marriage, and of course under normal conditions

¹ If Samson's marriage was, as has been very plausibly suggested, originally of the *mo'a* type, it is especially significant that the redactor, in trying to make an older tale agree with the regular conventions of his time, chooses just this circumstance as characteristic of the typical Hebrew marriage.

² It may not be commonly known that child-marriages took place in England even as late as the times of Queen Elizabeth. The depositions that were taken in the Bishops' Court of the diocese of Chester in the trial of certain of these cases during the years 1561-66 have been edited by Mr. Furnivall for the Early English Text Society (1897), and make very surprising reading. In 1564 a witness deposes concerning the marriage of John Somerforth, aged three, to Jane Brerton, aged two, and we can readily believe another witness who testified that "it was the youngest Marriage that euer he was at."

the first wife becomes the mother of the cherished firstborn son. It is therefore inevitable that the first wife should tend strongly to occupy a leading position in the household, no matter how many legal wives or concubines¹ may succeed her, and this is indeed the case, except under very unusual circumstances, as for example, when the husband materially improves his social status after the first marriage, when the first wife remains childless, or when her family becomes humiliated or ruined. Now this primacy of the first wife is an actual fact among practically all polygamous peoples, past or present. I have tried to classify the peoples and religions among which this custom prevails, and while all the details are wearisome the general outlook is most significant.² The first wife holds the position of primacy and precedence which I have mentioned, of course with numerous inconsequential variations under different local conditions, among the Greenlanders, Alaskans (especially the Tlingits), Aleutians, Indians of the Northwest coast, Californian Indians, Crees, Sioux, Omahas, and Algonquins, the Mormons, the Mexicans, Central and South American tribes, especially those of Western Brazil, the Samoans, Tahitans, Ainos, Kamtschatkans, Mongols, Chinese, Siamese, Burmese, the inhabitants of the East Indian Archipelago, the Kalmucks, Central Asiatic Turks, the tribes of East and South Africa, especially the Zulus, the natives of Madagascar, and throughout the whole of Islam; from earlier times, among the pagan Prussians, the pagan Russians, the Egyptians,³ the

¹ For the purposes of our argument it is unnecessary to distinguish sharply between "polygamy" as the possession of several regular wives, and "juridic monogamy," where all wives but the first are really concubines. I use "polygamy" in its general, non-technical sense.

² For the detailed citation of the authorities in each individual case one may refer to E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, London, 1894, pp. 443-48; G. E. Howard, *History of Matrimonial Institutions*, Chicago, 1904, I, 143 f.; J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, London, 1910, p. 277 and p. 576.

³ Thus the *Pharaoh* added the name of only one wife on his inscriptions, and among the common people "a man possessed but one legal wife who was the mother of his heirs" (Breasted, *A History of Egypt*, New York, 1905, p. 85), though he might have a harem and concubines *ad libitum*. This wife was called "the dear wife," "the lady of the house." Regular bigamy was rare, though Erman (*Life in Ancient Egypt*, tr. Tirard, London, 1894, p. 152) cites occasional instances from the Pharaohs on down to the thieves of the royal tombs. The case of Cheuemhotep is interesting: Chety is his "beloved wife," "the lady of the house," and likewise the heiress to the Jackal nome which her son inherits, yet Tatet, doubtless his real favorite, is also called his

old Persians,¹ the Parthians,² and the same conditions prevailed in Chaldea in the twenty-second century B.C., as evidenced by the great code of Hammurabi.³ Very significant is the case in Islam. Despite the fact that Mahomet attempted to guarantee the complete legal and social equality of the four regular wives allowed the Moslem, there has everywhere, out of the economic conditions referred to above, grown up the custom which makes the first wife "the great lady," before whom the other wives, despite their recognized legal position, and despite any preference that the husband may have for any one of them, because of youth, beauty, or other advantages, take an inferior position, and to whom they frequently act in the rôle of servants. Anyone who has lived in Moslem countries remembers the pomp and circumstance which attend the first and formal wedding, the ceremonies lasting frequently for several days, while a second, or third, or fourth wife is generally taken in so quiet a fashion, that it is frequently only by the outbreak of those noises and scenes peculiar to feminine combats that even the immediate neighborhood is apprised of a fresh matrimonial venture. So frequently, as among the modern Turkish fellaheen and the ancient Hebrews, the first wife is of equal social station with the husband, whereas the subsequent wives may or may not be, according to circumstances.

wife, and occupies with her children a place on the inscription behind Chety and her heirs. The precedence which the heiress obtains is thus typically expressed here. A peculiar Egyptian form of marriage by which an heiress might take a husband on contract and dismiss him later at pleasure with some pecuniary compensation (cf. Spiegelberg, *Schriften d. wiss. Gesellschaft in Strassburg*, I, 1907) may have helped a little in securing a somewhat superior position for woman in general. It finds a close parallel in the contract marriage of pre-Islamitic Arabia, in which various stipulations (generally against a second wife) might be made by the woman. See J. Wellhausen, "Die Ehe bei den Arabern," *Nachr. d. kgl. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, 1893, pp. 466 f.

¹ The Persian king had four regular wives, but only one queen, who was legally, at least, mistress over all the rest, and this same situation doubtless recurred among the nobility, who likewise had several wives. Cf. G. Rawlinson, *The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient World*, III, 216 ff., London, 1871, and for details, Fr. Spiegel, *Erânische Altertumskunde*, III, pp. 677 ff., Leipzig, 1878. Strange to say, the new *Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie* seems nowhere to mention this phase of the subject.

² G. Rawlinson, *The Sixth Gt. Orient. Mon.*, London, 1873, p. 423.

³ See paragraphs 140 ff. and 170 of the Code, and Cook's excellent discussion of these details, contrasting them with the Hebrew usage, *op. cit.*, pp. 110 ff. It may be remarked that these paragraphs of the Code are in accord with other early Babylonian legal documents.

Now this Homeric word *κουρίδιος* is peculiarly appropriate as a designation of the first bride, the one taken in her own and her husband's youth, that is to say, she is "the bride of youth." For we know that the old patriarchal family was the prevailing institution in the Homeric age. The sons brought their wives to the father's house, where each had his special apartment, though an especially favored son might have a separate house, as Hector and Paris in Ilium. So the family of Nestor, of Aiolos, of Alkinoos, of Laertes (where Odysseus builds his own bridal chamber onto his father's house), and especially the house of Priam, which must have looked like a fair-sized village settlement—a state within the state. I need not here rehearse details of bargaining for a bride in Homer, as they are familiar to all. The name given to maidens, *παρθενοὶ ἀλφεσίβοιαι*, meaning "those who bring in possessions of cattle," epitomizes conveniently Homeric usage.¹ A typical case, too, is the formal proposal of marriage to one of his daughters, with detailed specification of the gifts that go with her, which Agamemnon makes to the offended Achilles (I, 141 ff.). In a word, the economic conditions prevailing in Homer in the general feature of the marriage relation are quite those of the polygamous peoples we have mentioned. More than that, we can parallel even the expression. Three times in later Hebrew literature the very same idea occurs: Prov. 5:18, "Let thy fountain be blessed, and rejoice in *the wife of thy youth*"; Mal. 2:14, "The Lord hath been a witness between thee and *the wife of thy youth* against whom thou hast dealt treacherously," and vs. 15, "Therefore take heed to your spirit and let none deal treacherously against *the wife of his youth*"; and Trito-Isaiah 54:6, "For the Lord hath called thee as a wife forsaken and grieved in spirit, even as *a wife of youth* when she is cast off, saith thy God."² Now it is impossible to fail to observe here a distinct preference felt for the

¹ Cf. G. Murray's interesting remarks à propos of these names in *-βοια*, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, 2 (i.e. 2d ed.) London, 1911, p. 186.

² Cf. Jer. 3:4, where, in speaking of Jahve as the spouse of Judah, the prophet calls him "the guide [or companion] of my youth," i.e., the regular, legal husband of first marriage. See Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, Cambridge, 1885, p. 118. A striking parallel to this more tender sentiment toward the wife of one's youth appears in the Leyden papyrus No. 371 (of a late period), where a widower in pathetic address to his dead wife cries, "thou didst become my wife when I was young, and I was with thee. . . ." (Erman, l.c.)

first wife, that "of thy youth," divorce or even neglect of whom seemed a much more heinous sin than similar ill-treatment of another wife, and such expressions presuppose a well-developed recognition of the social precedence of the first wife, however little this may have been embodied in actual law—precisely as we have seen in the case in Islam. Nevertheless, there is evidence from extremely ancient times of the preferential position of the first wife and her offspring. Thus in the most primitive scheme of social differentiation between Bedouin tribes (Gen. 4:19 ff.), the sons of Adah, Lamech's first wife, are those that dwell in tents and have possession of cattle, together with the musicians (like the Homeric *αοιδοί*), while the children of Zillah, the second wife, were Tubal-Cain, the ancestor of the blacksmiths (an inferior caste among the Bedouin to this day), and Naamah, "the lovely," very probably the ancestress of the prostitutes, as Ed. Meyer suggests. See his illuminating discussion of this passage in *Die Isrealiten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, Halle, 1896, p. 218. In fact, Meyer has no hesitation in classing Hebrew and old Sumerian and Akkadian customs together, asserting flatly that there were only the *Hauptfrau* and *Nebenfrauen* along with *Kebsweiber* among all these peoples. See his *Geschichte des Alterthums*,² I, 2, paragraph 422.

Bigamy was of course the common rule among the Hebrews, and Ezekiel speaks without any constraint of Jahve and his two wives, Aholah and Aholibah, Israel and Judah.¹ The second wife was commonly called "the foe," and the two wives were frequently distinguished as "the loved" and "the hated." Nevertheless, the very fact that the second wife, however beautiful and fruitful she might have been, was rarely able to accomplish the divorce of the first wife, despite the fact that she had supplanted her in her husband's affections, proves that the first wife was securely intrenched in her position both by custom and by the husband's self-interest.² The three passages just cited are probably all later than the sixth century B.C.—along with the Jahvist account of creation, a single equal help-

¹ See Engert's excellent discussion of this point, *op. cit.*, pp. 27 ff. The great antiquity of this institution is proved by the existence in the primitive Semitic *Gemeinsprache* of the word for a second wife; see Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, pp. 448 f.

² The Deuteronomistic code especially intervened to guarantee the claim of the firstborn son, even though he be the child of "the hated," that is, under normal conditions, of course, the first wife (Deut. 21:15-17).

meet for a single man—and they are significant of a refinement of sentiment regarding the wife of youth that before long led to the monogamy which prevailed in the time of Jesus and thenceforth.¹ And so in spite of the comparatively late date of these utterances regarding the first wife, the arguments which have just been given, combined with the perfectly clear-cut way in which Hammurabi's Code recognizes the primacy of the first wife, make it highly probable that even from the very first the wife of youth among the Hebrews also was felt to be, other things being equal, in a position, conventionally at least, regarded as superior to that of her successors.²

To all this the objection is certain to be raised that the Indo-Europeans were monogamous, and hence the Homeric Greeks likewise, while the present argument tacitly assumes a plurality of wives. Now it is indeed probable that the Indo-Europeans were, as a general thing, at least as far as the common people were concerned, conventionally monogamous. But we must remember that in all the cases with which we are dealing in Homer we have princely or heroic houses, and it is almost a platitude to observe that at all times and circumstances the nobility have allowed themselves far greater latitude in sexual and other forms of license than the common man has

¹ So gradually did this most important modification of a great social institution come about, that without rescinding any of the old law, either by new revelation or otherwise, and with scarce a single hint in any of the very considerable literature of that and subsequent times, bigamy so completely passed out of existence that neither John, nor Jesus, nor any writer of the early church felt it of sufficient importance even to mention the matter. And so, curiously enough, the Old Testament law has remained apparently in actual force, to the considerable confusion of the church. Witness Luther's famous quibbling on the matter, and the justification which the Mormons and Mohammedans have drawn for their practices; indeed, I am told on credible authority that in one of our northern states, little more than a generation ago, it was found impracticable to dismiss a prominent member of one of the greatest Protestant denominations who persisted in maintaining a harem and who defended his actions by the authority of the patriarchs and the Mosaic law.

² Cook, in the work just cited, has set forth a large number of the differences between the Code of Hammurabi and the laws of Moses. They arise primarily from the different conditions of life which prevail in nomadic and in agricultural society. The status of woman, however, seems not to be related in any essential way to the circumstances of a settled habitation and more elaborately developed commercial institutions. Too much cannot be inferred from the silence of the Mosaic legislation relative to the primacy of the first wife. From the Koran alone no one would expect to find the first wife in Islam occupying the position of superiority which is actually hers, and the same may be true of the Old Testament. Compare, for example, the very singular omission to specify the cohabitation of father and daughter among the illicit relations (Lev., chaps. 18 and 20), though there can be no doubt that this was not allowed.

been granted or could afford. In the rather trenchant words of the Kalmuck proverb, "the great people—and dogs—know no bonds of kin." There is, moreover, a great mass of testimony to prove at least sporadic prevalence of polygamy among many of the Indo-European peoples, which Schrader (*Sprachvergl. und Urgsch.*,³ III, 341 ff.) has collected. The Rig-Veda is full of it among kings and nobles; Herodotos i. 135 attests polygamy for the Persians; Caesar tells us that Ariovistus had two wives, and Tacitus (*Germania* 18) speaks of the numerous wives that the powerful German princes had; the Kelts in Gaul had several wives apiece, according to Caesar; bigamy is common in the old Norse Sagas and it is likewise well attested for the Thracians, the Paionians, the Old Prussians, the early Slavs, etc. There is thus any amount of antecedent probability that the heroes of the Homeric age were, as far as they wanted to be, polygamous, and there are many facts to bear out the assumption. To be sure, that has been denied by some scholars under the influence of the romantic idealizers who wished to find every virtue blooming in pristine freshness among the Hellenes, and this single false prejudice has done most to obscure the meaning of *κουριδῖος*. Certain obvious facts there are, however. For example, there is no word which means exclusively "wife" in Homeric Greek, or in any other Greek, for that matter, *ἄλοχος*, which comes nearest to it, including persons whom we should not call wives at all. Thus Achilles calls Briseis the *ἄλοχος* of Agamemnon (I 336), and uses *ἄλοχοι* of mistresses in general (vs. 340), and Hermes calls Leto an *ἄλοχος* of Zeus, though she was so only upon occasion (Φ 499). Again, the great court of Priam was manifestly typical of the patriarchal family house, as economists and historians have generally recognized, and Priam had besides Hekabe, his chief wife, Laothoe and Kastianeira as regular wives, not to mention the concubines who were the mothers of his bastards. Now it is incorrect to call this an oriental harem and stigmatize the Trojans as *βάρβαροι* in this respect,¹ for there is nothing in Homer to justify such a position. Indeed, the most beautiful and affecting scene depicting the ideal wedded life is set in Troy with the characters of Hektor and Andromache. Among persons so frankly irregular

¹ Compare the sensible remarks of K. Koch on this point in his *Program: Zur Stellung der Frau bei Homer*, Eisenach, 1909, p. 9.

as were the Homeric chiefs it is idle to dispute about the question of any strict monogamy. Did not each of the heroes have his beautiful captive to cheer him in the intervals of battle? Does not Agamemnon, even in offering Achilles his own daughter, frankly add seven beautiful Lesbian women and the twenty most beautiful Trojan women after Helen, obviously to fill the harem of his prospective son-in-law? Did not Menelaos, when Helen remained childless, take to wife a slave woman, who bore him Megapenthes? And it was this latter's wedding that he and Helen were celebrating on a grand scale, when Telemachos dropped in for news of his father. The poet obviously sympathizes deeply with poor Laertes, who paid a huge price for the beautiful Eurykleia and yet was disappointed after all, because he was afraid of the wrath of his wife—as Homer puts it—a testimony much more to the vigorous personality of Antikleia than to any recognized institution of monogamy. Besides, the poet is quite inconsistent regarding this unusual virtue on the part of Laertes, for later on, in an undoubtedly most ancient episode of the Nostos, Eurykleia appears unequivocally as the wet-nurse of the infant Odysseus, τ 482, σὺ δέ μ' ἔτρεφες αὐτῇ | τῷ σῶ ἐπὶ μᾶζω, "It was thou that didst nurse me there at thine own breast" (B. and L.), and infidelity toward Laertes would have been cruelly punished, while there is neither hint nor likelihood of her having been married to any retainer.

Again, if the anthropomorphic Gods of Greece were such in their marital relations as in all others, our argument were proved beyond all doubt; it is sufficient merely to hint at the highly gallant and certainly not infrequent adventures of a Zeus or an Apollo, and the former had at least two regular wives, Dione and Hera. Furthermore, the very kernel of several heroic tales involves the motive of recognized polygamy. Even under the modernizing hand of Euripides, Jason weds Kreusa in Korinth without the least hint of divorcing Medea, who leaves quite on her own initiative. Likewise in the Trachiniai of Sophokles, Herakles takes the new wife Iole without any indication of divorcing Deianeira or making her position untenable,¹ and she seeks merely to guarantee the continuance of his love by forwarding the robe of Nessos. But all this, together with

¹ Cf. vs. 546: . . . κοινωρούσα τῶν αὐτῶν γάμων.

much more similar evidence, has been gathered together by Ernst Hruza in his *Polygamie und Pellikat nach griechischem Rechte*, Leipzig, 1894, 11 ff., especially 25 ff., who traces instances of bigamy even down into Athens of the fourth century and elsewhere in Greece, so that the two most famous instances of historical times—Anaxandridas of Sparta and Dionysios the First of Syracuse—are really not so isolated as has often been thought.

It remains but to consider now in detail the instances of the occurrence of *κουρίδιος* in Homer. Several passages are very favorable to, if they do not distinctly imply, the original meaning which we have posited for the word. For example, both Paris and Menelaos speak of Helen as the *κουριδίη ἄλοχος* of the latter (H 392, N 626), though there is nothing to imply that she is not the legal wife of Paris also, who is called her *πόσις* and her *παράκοιτις*, capture being in all civilizations recognized as a legal form of marriage, where it is not actually enjoined upon the bridegroom. More significant is the passage where second marriage is spoken of: Athene addressing Telemachos in a dream observes (o 21 ff.): "Thou knowest of what sort is the heart of a woman within her; all her desire is to increase the house of the man who takes her to wife, but of her former children and of her dear lord she has no more memory once he is dead, and she asks concerning him no more" (B. and L.). Here the first husband is the *κουρίδιος φίλος*, "the dear one of youth," the second is merely *κείνος ὃς κεν ὀπυίῃ*. Now it is obvious that here *κουρίδιος* cannot mean merely "legally wedded"—the second husband was just as legally wedded as the first, but only the first could be the "husband of youth," precisely as Menelaos is so characterized even on the lips of Paris, though the latter would be the very last person to emphasize his rival's *legal* advantages over him, if that implication lie in the word. On the other hand, Menelaos *was* the husband of Helen's youth—there was no denying that—and the use of this appellation was merely a convenient way of distinguishing Helen's former from her present husband. This meaning is also peculiarly appropriate in A 241 ff., where Iphidamas "slept the sleep of bronze, wretched man, far from his wedded wife, defending his fellow-citizens, even the *wife of his youth*, of whom he knew no joy, though he paid a great price for her, etc." The same holds true

for the three passages in the Homeric Hymns where the word occurs, 6, 17; 2, 136; and especially 5, 127, where Aphrodite persuades the not unnaturally very credulous Anchises that she is the *virgin* daughter of Otreus of Phrygia, come especially to wed him. In only one case might there be a reasonable doubt, that where Patroklos promises to make Briseis the *κουρίδιος ἄλοχος* of Achilles, on his return from Troy (T 297 ff.). Now Briseis had been married before (vss. 291 ff.), but Achilles was as yet unmarried, and in taking Briseis he would be taking a "wife of youth" in a perfectly literal sense, though even then it is more likely that the adjective bears its secondary meaning, "lawfully wedded." For this secondary meaning undoubtedly appears in Homer, as is evident from its combination with *λέχος* and *δῶμα*, which are obviously not "youthful" in any sense, but "belonging to the wedding of youth," i.e., the formally solemnized and hence the most regularly recognized one. Such a change in the meaning of the word in Homer signifies that the ground for the formal distinction between the wife wedded in youth, and the one wedded later, was rapidly being lost in the tenth and ninth centuries B.C. in Ionia, where monogamous marriage prevailed, and that therefore the secondary meaning was coming to be the only one commonly understood, as from the sixth century onward it is the only meaning for the word which Greek literature recognizes.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS